(*d*) the total amount estimated by Government for the construction of the bridge and the total amount that has to be given to the contractor on the completion of the bridge?

MR. G. B. E. TRUSCOTT: (*a*)

Names of contractors.	*Amount.*
	Rs.
1. Messrs. Sarma Bros. ...	16,704
2. Mr. P. I. Gopalan Nair ...	17,973
3. Mr. R. Narayana Pillai ...	19,618
4. Messrs. Gannon Dunkerly & Co., Ltd.	19,370
5. Messrs. Mckenzies Ltd. ...	29,377
6. Mr. N. O. Francis ...	17,211
7. Messrs. J. C. Gammon & Co. ...	22,776
8. Mr. R. Kesava Pillai ...	16,770
9. General Construction Company ...	23,767

(*b*) It is not in public interests to answer questions as to the nature of departmental recommendations.

(*c*) This does not arise in the nature of the answer to Part (*b*).

(*d*) The total amount estimated for Bridge works is Rs. 22,335 and the amount to be paid to the contractor is Rs. 22,742/11.

MR. K. P. KOCHUKORATHARAKAN: ഈ ജോലിയെ എപ്പിച്ചുള്ള ആർക്കാണെന്നു ഞാൻ ചോദ്യം ചോദിച്ചിരുന്നു. അതിനു മറുപടി പറഞ്ഞുകാണുന്നില്ല.

MR. G. B. E. TRUSCOTT: The work was given to Messrs. Gammon.

MR. K. P. KOCHUKORATHARAKAN: ആ പാട്ടത്തിനു എന്തെങ്കിലും കേട്ട പറയിട്ടുള്ളതായി അറിയാമോ?

MR. G. B. E. TRUSCOTT: No, Sir.

Circular re: P. W. D. contracts.

140. ✻ **MR. K. P. KOCHUKORATHARAKAN:** Will the Government be pleased to state:

(*a*) whether any circular has been issued to Division Officers, Sub-Division Officers or Section Officers of the P. W. Department by the Government or by the Chief Engineer to the effect that P. W. D. contracts should not be given to Vakils practising in courts, members of the Sri Mulam Assembly, members of the Sri Chitra State Council, proprietors and editors of news papers and to the near relatives of Government officers, especially of the P. W. Department;

(*b*) if so, whether they will lay on the table a statement showing who issued it, the reason for issuing it, and the date on which it was issued, as also a copy of the said circular; and

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. K. P. Kochukoratharakan.]

(*c*) (i) if no such circular has been sent, whether any circular has been issued either by the Chief Engineer or the Government to Division Officers, Sub-Division Officers, or Section Officers that at least some of the persons mentioned above should not be given P. W. D. contracts;

(ii) if so, whether it is the Chief Engineer or the Government who sent it:

(iii) the date of issue;

(iv) if it has been so sent, whether there is any special reason therefor: and

(v) if there is such a circular, whether they will lay on the table a true copy of it?

MR. G. B. E. TRUSCOTT: (*a*) No.

(*b*) This does not arise in view of the answer to part (*a*).

(*c*) (i) Yes.

(ii) The Chief Engineer.

(iii) 7-7-1937.

(iv) As the practicing Vakils who take up contract works cannot have effective personal supervision of the works and therefore they invariably sublet the contracts against the recognised rules and as it is an accepted principle that members of the Legislative bodies should not take up contracts or have any financial interest in the funds of which they are in control.

(v) * A true copy of the Circular is placed on the table.

Pier at Alleppey.

141. *MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI (*Nominated*): Will the Government be pleased to state:

(*a*) the name and qualification of the Port Officer who was in charge at Alleppey when Mr. Ash, the Special Engineer of the Vizagapatam Harbour Works was invited by Government to render advice regarding the sandsilting, and improvement of the pier at Alleppey; and

(*b*) what remuneration was paid to Mr. Ash and what was the salary of the then Port Officer at Alleppey?

MR. C. O. MADHAVAN (*Ag. Chief Secretary to Government*): (*a*) W. J. Swan Esq., Lieut. Commander R. N. R. (Retired).

(*b*) Remuneration paid to Mr. Ash was Bh. Rs. 1823-6-0 including T. A.

Salary of the then Port Officer—Bh. Rs. 600 per mensem.

MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI: May I know the present salary of the Port Officer?

MR. C. O. MADHAVAN: He gets his permanent pay of Rs. 325 plus the acting allowance of Rs. 100.

* *Vide* Appendix II, page 558.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Appendix II.

Vide Answer to Question No. 140.

Confidential.

Chief Engineer's Office.
Trivandrum.

Dear Sir,

With reference to your confidential D. O. letter of 28th April 1937 I have consulted the other Division Officers *re* your proposals and have also discussed the same with Government with the result that it may now be laid down that (i) practising Vakils should not be allowed to take up contracts in the Department, and (ii) that members of the State Council and Legislative Assembly should not be given contracts unless there is some very special reason for which approval of higher authority must be first obtained.

Yours etc.,
(Sd.) G. B. E. Truscott.

To

S. Sesha Iyer Esq.

Division Officer, Nagercoil.

Gl. No. 763 dated 7-7-37.

Copy forwarded to other Division Officers for information and guidance with reference to his No.

(Sd.) G. B. E. TRUSCOTT,
Chief Engineer.

(True copy)

NOTICE OF ADJOURNMENT MOTION.

PRESIDENT: I have received notice of an adjournment motion from Mr. P. K. Kunju which is as follows:

> "I intend asking for leave to move for an adjournment of the business of the Assembly for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the hardship and discontent caused by fixing a higher rate in Transport Buses than the Railway fare between Trivandrum and Quilon".

This is obviously out of order honourable member must have been aware that we are dealing now with the budget; and when the question of commercial transport comes up before the House for discussion, this matter about the fares can be taken up, agitated and all its *pros and cons* discussed. Secondly, as a matter of urgent public importance, this is not a matter of such a paramount importance that there can be no delay in the matter of agitation. Honourable members must know that this fare was fixed some weeks ago and no representation was made to Government then with regard to this. It appears to me that to allow a motion of this kind is to abuse the rules regarding motions for adjournment of the House. So I disallow the motion.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly